



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*C.16*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,039	09/23/2002	Ivars Kalvins	81847	9469

23685 7590 10/11/2005  
KRIEGSMAN & KRIEGSMAN  
665 FRANKLIN STREET  
FRAMINGHAM, MA 01702

EXAMINER

SACKEY, EBENEZER O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1626

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of Claims**

This is in reference to applicant's amendment filed 08/16/05.

Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 12 are pending.

Claims 6-8, 11 and 13-14 have been cancelled.

### ***Response to Amendment***

The rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph has been withdrawn. However, a new ground of rejection has been applied.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for organic "R" groups listed on page 3 of the specification, i.e., methyl, ethane, ethane, cyclopropane, thiophene etc., does not reasonably provide enablement for any and all organic group. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 1626

For rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered (In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC, 1988)):

- 1) Nature of invention.
- 2) State of prior art.
- 3) Quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure
- 4) Level of predictability in the art.
- 5) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor.
- 6) Existence of working examples.
- 7) Breadth of claims.
- 8) Level of ordinary skill in the art.

See below:

1) Nature of the invention.

The nature of the invention relates to 1-aziridino-hydroxyiminomethyl derivatives, drugs containing these compounds and methods of using the derivatives in treating various cancers such as colon, stomach, lung, breast and uterine. The asserted utility is the treatment of various cancers as stated.

2) State of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art.

It is the state of the art that aziridine derivatives are known in the art for their pharmaceutical activities as evidenced by Tsou et al., "Synthesis of Possible Cancer Chemotherapeutic Compounds Based on Enzyme Approach. IV. Aziridine Derivatives", Jour. Med. Chem. 1963, pages 435-439.

Art Unit: 1626

There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below:

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute.

Thus, in the absence of a showing of correlation between any and all organic group claimed as capable being used in the instant compound or composition, one of ordinary skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound or composition due to the unpredictability associated with the role of all organic groups.

3) Quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of ordinary skill in the art would need to determine which organic group would be applicable.

4) Level of predictability in the art.

The art pertaining to any organic group remains highly unpredictable. As disclosed above, there is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art.

5) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor.

The amount of direction or guidance present is found on page 3 wherein a limited selection of organic groups is provided.

6) Existence of working examples.

As discussed above, working example is found on pages 10-11 and 19 wherein mean IC<sub>50</sub> values were determined for compound number 6.

Applicant's limited working example does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use the plethora of organic groups encompassed by the instant claims. At best, the organic group currently asserted for the instant invention is the list which appears on page 3 of the specification.

7) Breadth of claims.

Claims 1 and dependent claim 4 are extremely broad due to the vast number of possible organic groups encompassed by the instant claims.

8) Level of ordinary skill in the art.

The level of ordinary skill in the art is high. Due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by *in vitro* and *in vivo* screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which group or moiety would be beneficial.

Hence, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of any organic group. As a result necessitating one of ordinary skill in the art to perform an exhaustive search for which group would be applicable in order to practice the claimed invention.

*Genentec Inc. V. Novo Nordisk A/S* (CAFC) 42 USPQ 2D 1001, states that:

“a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion” and “[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable”.

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors, and *In re Fisher* (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to determine which organic group is encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 10 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1626

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

---

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to E. Sackey whose telephone number is (571) 272-0704.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane, can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(571) 272-1600.

EOS

October 6, 2005

  
for Joseph K. McKane  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1626, Group 1600  
Technology Center 1